



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,443	10/15/2003	Joe Reyes	H0004247	8789

128 7590 09/29/2005

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
P O BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

SANTIAGO CORDERO, MARIVELISSE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2687

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/687,443	REYES, JOE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marivelisse Santiago-Cordero	2687	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

dy

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character “231” has been used to designate both: if the outcome of query “230” is NO and if the outcome of query “234” is NO (Fig. 4). In addition, reference character “234” has been used to designate both TRANSCVR ON/TIMER ON and $\text{TIMER} \geq \text{TC}$ (Fig. 4).
2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: “223” (page 12, paragraph [0027]), “232” (page 13, paragraph [0028]), and “235” (page 13, paragraph [0028]).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing-sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

In addition to Replacement Sheets containing the corrected drawing figure(s), applicant is required to submit a marked-up copy of each Replacement Sheet including annotations indicating the changes made to the previous version. The marked-up copy must be clearly labeled as “Annotated Sheets” and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that

Art Unit: 2687

explains the change(s) to the drawings. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)(1). Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing and marked-up copy will result in the abandonment of the application.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term “boom mike PTT switch 24” (page 6, paragraph [0016], line 4) should be replaced with --boom mike PTT switch 26--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 7-11 are objected to because of the following informalities: the preamble of claim 7 discloses, among other things, “a radio transmitter”, i.e., a single radio transmitter; however, in lines 6-7 and 10 of the claim it discloses “each of the radio transmitters” and “one of the radio transmitters”, respectively, i.e., a plurality of radio transmitters. Appropriate correction is required in order to be consistent with the claim terminology.

In addition, the numbering of the steps in claim 7 should be corrected (note the repetition of “(iii)”). Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claims 9-10 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: the dependency of the claims is incorrect.

Claim 9 recites an **apparatus** claim depending on claim 1, which, on the other hand, is based on a **system** claim. For examination on the merits, the dependency of claim 9 will correspond to the apparatus of claim 7, in order to be consistent with the claim terminology. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 14 recites a **method** claim depending on claim 11, which, on the other hand, is based on an **apparatus** claim. For examination on the merits, the dependency of claim 14 will

Art Unit: 2687

correspond to the method of claim 12, in order to be consistent with the claim terminology.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Battin et al. (hereinafter “Battin”; Patent No.: 3,500,459).

Regarding claim 12, Battin discloses, in a communication system having one or more push-to-talk (PTT) switches that each have at least an ON position and an OFF position (Fig. 1; Abstract), and one or more radios that may be selectively coupled to receive a signal representative of each PTT switch position (Abstract; note the transmitter), a method for dealing with a STUCK-ON condition of a PTT switch (Abstract; col. 1, lines 44-51), the method comprising the steps of: determining whether a PTT switch is in the STUCK-ON condition (col. 2, lines 28-40); and if so, inhibiting the signal representative of the position of the PTT switch that is in the STUCK-ON condition from being received by each radio transmitter (Abstract; col. 2, lines 28-40 and 47-52).

Regarding claim 13, Battin discloses the method of claim 12 (see above), wherein the step of determining whether a PTT switch is in the STUCK-ON condition comprises determining that the PTT switch has been in the ON position for a predetermined period of time (Abstract; col. 2, lines 28-40).

Regarding claim 14, Battin discloses the method of claim 11, further comprising the step of turning on an ALARM to notify a user that the STUCK-ON condition has occurred (col. 2, lines 47-52).

8. Claims 1, 3-4, 12-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rutty et al. (hereinafter "Rutty"; Patent No.: 4,551,854).

Regarding claim 1, Rutty discloses an aircraft communication system (col. 1, lines 8-14), comprising: a plurality of radios (col. 1, lines 8-14); a plurality of push-to-talk (PTT) switches (col. 1, lines 1-8 and 23-30; note that there is a PTT switch for each radio; hence, a plurality of PTT switches), each PTT switch having at least an ON position and an OFF position and configured to supply an ON/OFF signal representative of the position of the PTT switch (Fig. 1, reference numeral 54; col. 1, lines 23-30); a controller in operable communication with each radio and coupled to receive the ON/OFF signal from each PTT switch (Fig. 1; col. 1, lines 24-29; col. 3, lines 32-46; col. 4, lines 1-8), the controller configured, in response to the ON/OFF signal, to (i) selectively enable one or more of the radios to transmit (col. 4, lines 39-68; col. 10, lines 58-64) (ii) determine whether each PTT switch is stuck in the ON position (col. 3, lines 32-38; col. 4, lines 1-17) and (iii) when a PTT switch is stuck in the ON position, to selectively disable transmission from one or more of the radios (col. 1, lines 1-8).

Regarding claim 3, Rutty discloses the system of claim 1 (see above), further comprising: one or more timer circuits (Fig. 1, reference numeral 136; col. 12, lines 18-27), each timer circuit configured to supply a time signal when at least one of the PTT switches is in the ON position (col. 4, lines 1-8; col. 12, lines 18-27), wherein the controller determines that a PTT switch is stuck in the ON position (col. 4, lines 1-8; col. 12, lines 18-27), a time signal indicates the PTT

Art Unit: 2687

switch has been in the ON position for at least a predetermined time value (col. 4, lines 1-8; col. 12, lines 18-27).

Regarding claim 4, Rutty discloses the system of claim 3 (see above), further comprising: a memory circuit in operable communication with the controller, the memory circuit having at least the predetermined time value stored therein (col. 4, lines 1-8; note that the memory circuit is inherently present in order for the system to know the predetermined time value).

Regarding claim 12, Rutty discloses, in a communication system having one or more push-to-talk (PTT) switches that each have at least an ON position and an OFF position (Fig. 1, reference numeral 54), and one or more radios that may be selectively coupled to receive a signal representative of each PTT switch position (Fig. 1, reference numeral 12; col. 7, lines 58-64), a method for dealing with a STUCK-ON condition of a PTT switch (col. 3, lines 32-38), the method comprising the steps of: determining whether a PTT switch is in the STUCK-ON condition (col. 4, lines 1-8); and if so, inhibiting the signal representative of the position of the PTT switch that is in the STUCK-ON condition from being received by each radio transmitter (col. 4, lines 1-8).

Regarding claim 13, Rutty discloses the method of claim 12 (see above), wherein the step of determining whether a PTT switch is in the STUCK-ON condition comprises determining that the PTT switch has been in the ON position for a predetermined period of time (col. 1, lines 1-8; col. 6, lines 23-29).

Regarding claim 15, Rutty discloses an audio control panel comprising: a controller adapted to receive an ON/OFF signal from each of a plurality of push-to-talk (PTT) switches having at least an ON position and an OFF position (Fig. 1; col. 1, lines 24-29; col. 12, lines 28-

Art Unit: 2687

64; note that there is a PTT switch for each radio; hence, a plurality of PTT switches), the controller configured, in response to the ON/OFF signals, to (i) selectively supply one or more radio enable signals (col. 4, lines 39-68; col. 10, lines 58-64) (ii) determine whether each PTT switch is stuck in an ON position (col. 3, lines 32-38; col. 4, lines 1-17) and (iii) when a PTT switch is stuck in the ON position, to selectively supply one or more radio disable signals (col. 1, lines 1-8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rutty in view of Clark et al. (hereinafter "Clark"; Patent No.: 5,148,159).

Regarding claim 2, Rutty discloses the system of claim 1 (see above). Rutty fails to disclose further comprising: an input buffer coupled between each PTT switch and the controller and configured to supply the buffered ON/OFF signals to the controller.

Art Unit: 2687

However, Clark discloses an input buffer coupled between each PTT switch and the controller and configured to supply the buffered ON/OFF signals to the controller (col. 6, lines 50-65; note that Clark discloses push button switches which are being interpreted as the PTT switches of Rutty).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to incorporate an input buffer coupled between each PTT switch and the controller of Rutty and configured to supply the buffered ON/OFF signals to the controller as suggested by Clark.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to incorporate an input buffer coupled between each PTT switch and the controller and configured to supply the buffered ON/OFF signals to the controller because it could supply a properly conditioned input signal (Clark: col. 6, lines 50-65).

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rutty in view of Scheuer (Patent No.: 6,160,496).

Regarding claim 5, Rutty discloses the system of claim 1 (see above). Rutty fails to disclose further comprising: a plurality of selection switches coupled to the controller, each selection switch configured to supply a radio selection signal, wherein the controller is further configured, in response to the radio selection signal, to determine which of the radios to selectively enable to transmit.

However, Scheuer discloses an aircraft communication system further comprising: a plurality of selection switches coupled to the controller (Fig. 1, reference numerals 104 and 244), each selection switch configured to supply a radio selection signal (col. 1, lines 27-35; col. 2,

Art Unit: 2687

lines 4-13; col. 3, lines 14-23; col. 5, lines 41-62), wherein the controller is further configured, in response to the radio selection signal, to determine which of the radios to selectively enable to transmit (Fig. 2; col. 1, lines 27-35; col. 2, lines 4-13; col. 3, lines 14-23 and 40-42; col. 5, lines 41-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to couple to the controller of Rutty a plurality of selection switches, each selection switch configured to supply a radio selection signal, wherein the controller is further configured, in response to the radio selection signal, to determine which of the radios to selectively enable to transmit as suggested by Scheuer.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to couple to the controller a plurality of selection switches, each selection switch configured to supply a radio selection signal, wherein the controller is further configured, in response to the radio selection signal, to determine which of the radios to selectively enable to transmit because conventional audio selector panels have inputs for at least two communication transceivers (Scheuer: col. 1, lines 27-28).

13. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rutty in view of Battin.

Regarding claim 6, Rutty discloses the system of claim 1 (see above). Rutty fails to disclose wherein the controller is further configured to supply an alarm signal when a PTT switch is determined to be stuck in the ON position, and wherein the system further comprises: an aircraft display unit (ADU) in operable communication with the controller and configured to supply an alarm upon receipt of the alarm signal.

However, Battin discloses wherein the controller is further configured to supply an alarm signal when a PTT switch is determined to be stuck in the ON position (col. 2, lines 47-52), and wherein the system further comprises: an aircraft display unit (ADU) in operable communication with the controller and configured to supply an alarm upon receipt of the alarm signal (col. 2, lines 47-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to supply an alarm signal when the PTT switch of Rutty is determined to be stuck in the ON position and wherein the system further comprises: an aircraft display unit (ADU) in operable communication with the controller and configured to supply an alarm upon receipt of the alarm signal as suggested by Battin.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to supply an alarm signal when the PTT switch is determined to be stuck in the ON position and wherein the system further comprises: an aircraft display unit (ADU) in operable communication with the controller and configured to supply an alarm upon receipt of the alarm signal because the operator of the transmitter will be notified that the emission is being blocked (Battin: col. 2, lines 47-52).

14. Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rutty in views of Scheuer (Patent No.: 6,610,496) and Yao et al. (hereinafter "Yao"; Patent No.: 5,983,114).

Regarding claim 7, Rutty discloses an apparatus for handling a STUCK-ON condition of a push-to-talk (PTT) switch coupled to a radio transmitter (col. 3, lines 32-38), comprising: a PTT switch configured to supply a PTT ON/OFF signal (Fig. 1, reference numeral 54; col. 4, lines 13-17); a controller coupled to the PTT switch and each of the radio transmitters (Fig. 1),

Art Unit: 2687

and configured to: (i) receive the PTT ON/OFF signal and the radio selection signal (Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 39-45); (iii) determine whether the PTT switch is in the STUCK-ON condition (col. 4, lines 1-8); (iv) until the STUCK-ON condition occurs, supply either a TRANSMIT or a STANDBY command to the selected radio based on the PTT switch ON/OFF signal (col. 4, lines 1-8), to thereby cause the radio transmitter to transmit or not transmit, respectively (col. 4, lines 1-8); and (v) when the STUCK-ON condition occurs, ignore the PTT switch ON/OFF signal and place the selected radio transmitter in STANDBY (col. 4, lines 1-8).

Rutty fails to disclose a plurality of selection switches, each selection switch configured to supply a radio selection signal; a controller coupled to each of the selection switches; receive the PTT ON/OFF signal and the radio selection signal **from each selection switch**; and placing the selected radio transmitter in STANDBY **without affecting the activity of other PTT switches available to be coupled to the radio transmitter**.

However, Scheuer discloses a plurality of selection switches (Fig. 1, reference numerals 104 and 244), each selection switch configured to supply a radio selection signal (col. 1, lines 27-35; col. 2, lines 4-13; col. 3, lines 14-23; col. 5, lines 41-62); a controller coupled to each of the selection switch (col. 3, lines 14-23 and 40-42); and receive the PTT ON/OFF signal and the radio selection signal **from each selection switch** (Fig. 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to incorporate in the apparatus for handling a stuck-on condition of a PTT switch of Rutty, a plurality of selection switches, each selection switch configured to supply a radio selection signal, a controller coupled to each of the selection switch and receive the PTT

Art Unit: 2687

ON/OFF signal and the radio selection signal from each selection switch as suggested by Scheuer.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to incorporate in the apparatus for handling a stuck-on condition of a PTT switch of Rutty, a plurality of selection switches, each selection switch configured to supply a radio selection signal, a controller coupled to each of the selection switch, and receive the PTT ON/OFF signal and the radio selection signal from each selection switch because conventional audio selector panels have inputs for at least two communication transceivers (Scheuer: col. 1, lines 27-28).

Rutty in combination with Scheuer fail to disclose placing the selected radio transmitter in **STANDBY without affecting the activity of other PTT switches available to be coupled to the radio transmitter.**

However, Yao, in an apparatus for handling a STUCK-ON condition of a push-to-talk (PTT) switch coupled to a radio transmitter (col. 2, lines 39-47), discloses placing the selected radio transmitter in **STANDBY without affecting the activity of other PTT switches available to be coupled to the radio transmitter** (from col. 2, line 58 through col. 3, line 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to place the selected radio transmitter in **STANDBY** of Rutty in combination with Scheuer without affecting the activity of other PTT switches available to be coupled to the radio transmitter as suggested by Yao.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to place the selected radio transmitter in **STANDBY** without affecting the activity of other PTT switches available to be

Art Unit: 2687

coupled to the radio transmitter because it would grant other radio transmitters with talking privileges (Yao: from col. 2, line 58 through col. 3, line 3).

Regarding claim 9, in the obvious combination, Ruty discloses further comprising: a timer circuits configured to selectively supply a time signal (Fig. 1, reference numeral 136), wherein the controller determines that the STUCK-ON condition occurs when the time signal exceeds a predetermine threshold (col. 4, lines 1-8).

Regarding claim 10, in the obvious combination, Ruty discloses further comprising: a memory circuit in operable communication with the controller, the memory circuit having at least the predetermined time value stored therein (col. 4, lines 1-8; note that the memory circuit is inherently present in order for the system to know the predetermined time value).

15. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruty in combination with Scheuer and Yao as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Clark.

Regarding claim 8, Ruty in combination with Scheuer and Yao disclose the apparatus of claim 7 (see above). Ruty fails to disclose further comprising: an input buffer coupled between each PTT switch and the controller and configured to supply the buffered ON/OFF signals to the controller.

However, Clark discloses an input buffer coupled between each PTT switch and the controller and configured to supply the buffered ON/OFF signals to the controller (col. 6, lines 50-65; note that Clark discloses push button switches which are being interpreted as the PTT switches of Ruty in combination with Scheuer and Yao).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to incorporate an input buffer coupled between each PTT switch and the

Art Unit: 2687

controller of Rutty in combination with Scheuer and Yao and configured to supply the buffered ON/OFF signals to the controller as suggested by Clark.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to incorporate an input buffer coupled between each PTT switch and the controller and configured to supply the buffered ON/OFF signals to the controller because it could supply a properly conditioned input signal (Clark: col. 6, lines 50-65).

16. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rutty in combination with Scheuer and Yao as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Battin.

Regarding claim 11, Rutty in combination with Scheuer and Yao disclose the apparatus of claim 7 (see above). Rutty in combination with Scheuer and Yao fail to disclose wherein the controller is further configured to supply an alarm signal when a PTT switch is determined to be stuck in the ON position, and wherein the system further comprises: an aircraft display unit (ADU) in operable communication with the controller and configured to supply an alarm upon receipt of the alarm signal.

However, Battin discloses wherein the controller is further configured to supply an alarm signal when a PTT switch is determined to be stuck in the ON position (col. 2, lines 47-52), and wherein the system further comprises: an aircraft display unit (ADU) in operable communication with the controller and configured to supply an alarm upon receipt of the alarm signal (col. 2, lines 47-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to supply an alarm signal when the PTT switch of Rutty in combination with Scheuer and Yao is determined to be stuck in the ON position and wherein the system

Art Unit: 2687

further comprises: an aircraft display unit (ADU) in operable communication with the controller and configured to supply an alarm upon receipt of the alarm signal as suggested by Battin.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to supply an alarm signal when the PTT switch is determined to be stuck in the ON position and wherein the system further comprises: an aircraft display unit (ADU) in operable communication with the controller and configured to supply an alarm upon receipt of the alarm signal because the operator of the transmitter will be notified that the emission is being blocked (Battin: col. 2, lines 47-52).

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Arndt et al. (Patent No.: 4,932,071) discloses an aircraft communication system, which determines a STUCK-ON condition of a PTT switch and an alarm notification, among other things; Nakamura et al. (Pub. No.: 2003/0154008) discloses a button-stuck malfunction notice system.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marivelisse Santiago-Cordero whose telephone number is (571) 272-7839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


9/26/05
LESTER G. KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER